

REMARKS

Assignee respectfully requests entry of the following amendments and remarks in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed November 10, 2009. Assignee respectfully submits that the amendments and remarks contained herein place the instant application in condition for allowance.

Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1 – 18, and 24 are pending. In particular, Assignee amends claims 1, 3, 5, 10, 15, 18, and 24 and cancels claim 25 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Assignee cancels claim 25 merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Assignee reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Assignee so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action indicates that claim 25 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Assignee sincerely appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter and amend the pending claims, as indicated above.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Claim 1 is Allowable Over *Brown, Castro, and Wagner*

The Office Action indicates that claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,278,448 ("*Brown*") and further in view of HTML For the World Wide Web: 4th Edition with XHTML and CSS: Visual Quickstart Guide,

1999 (“*Castro*”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,085,224 (“*Wagner*”). This rejection is improper for at least the reason that *Brown* in view of *Castro* and *Wagner* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. More specifically, claim 1 recites:

A method for preventing data entry via a data input screen on a client device, comprising:

rendering, by the client device, source code that defines the data input screen in the client device;

defining an executable script within the source code; and

executing the executable script in response to user input,

wherein the executable script operates within the client device to render the data input screen inaccessible during processing of the user input to prevent duplicative execution of the executable script from subsequent user input, wherein upon completion of processing of the user input, the executable script renders the data input screen accessible;

wherein executing further comprises:

associating the executable script with a predetermined z-index number for a web page; and

rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page that have a z-index number lower than the predetermined z-index number, ***wherein the source code defines a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety.***

(Emphasis added).

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Brown*, *Castro*, and *Wagner*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a “method for preventing data entry via a data input screen on a client device... ***wherein the source code defines a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 1. More specifically, claim 1 includes allowable portions of claim 25. Further, *Brown* discloses “creating a composite desktop built from Web content retrieved from one or more Websites... [This] includes selecting one or more components of Web pages to be positioned on the composite desktop” (column 2, line 55). As is clearly evident, this is completely different than a “method for preventing data entry via a data input screen on a client device... ***wherein the source code defines a***

membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety” as recited in claim 1.

Similarly, *Castro* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown*. More specifically, *Castro* discloses “HTML 4 for the World Wide Web: Visual Quickstart Guide” (title), which is unquestionably different than a “method for preventing data entry via a data input screen on a client device... ***wherein the source code defines a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 1.

Further, *Wagner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown* and *Castro*. More specifically, *Wagner* discloses a “method and system for responding to hidden data and programs in a data stream” (title), which includes “an interceptor for intercepting a datastream before the datastream is received by an application program... [and] a scanner for scanning the intercepted data stream to detect a trigger event in the intercepted datastream” (column 4, line 15). However, *Wagner* fails to suggest a “method for preventing data entry via a data input screen on a client device... ***wherein the source code defines a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 1. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable.

B. Claim 5 is Allowable Over *Brown*, *Castro*, and *Wagner*

The Office Action indicates that claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,278,448 (“*Brown*”) and further in view of HTML For the World Wide Web: 4th Edition with XHTML and CSS: Visual Quickstart Guide, 1999 (“*Castro*”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,085,224 (“*Wagner*”). This rejection is improper for at least the reason that *Brown* in view of *Castro* and *Wagner* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 5. More specifically, claim 5 recites:

An apparatus for preventing entries or submissions of data via an input screen displayed on a client device, comprising:
a central processing unit;
a memory;
a user input device;
a display; and
a browser adapted to render the input screen on the display,

wherein source code is provided to the browser that contains instructions that are interpreted by the browser to render the input screen inaccessible after an executable script contained within source code is executed on the client device to prevent duplicative execution of the executable script from subsequent user input, wherein the input screen is rendered accessible after execution of the executable script,

wherein the source code further contains instructions which operate to:

generate association of the executable script with a predetermined z-index number for a web page; and

render inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page that have a z-index number lower than the predetermined z-index number, ***wherein the source code defines a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety.***

(Emphasis added).

Claim 5 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Brown*, *Castro*, and *Wagner*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests an “apparatus for preventing entries or submissions of data via an input screen displayed on a client device...

wherein the source code defines a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety” as recited in claim

5. More specifically, claim 5 includes allowable portions of claim 25. Further, *Brown* discloses “creating a composite desktop built from Web content retrieved from one or more Websites...

[This] includes selecting one or more components of Web pages to be positioned on the composite desktop” (column 2, line 55). As is clearly evident, this is completely different than an “apparatus for preventing entries or submissions of data via an input screen displayed on a client device... ***wherein the source code defines a membrane that is initially hidden and is***

positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety” as recited in claim 5.

Similarly, *Castro* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown*. More specifically, *Castro* discloses “HTML 4 for the World Wide Web: Visual Quickstart Guide” (title), which is unquestionably different than an “apparatus for preventing entries or submissions of data via an input screen displayed on a client device... ***wherein the source code defines a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 5.

Further, *Wagner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown* and *Castro*. More specifically, *Wagner* discloses a “method and system for responding to hidden data and programs in a data stream” (title), which includes “an interceptor for intercepting a datastream before the datastream is received by an application program... [and] a scanner for scanning the intercepted data stream to detect a trigger event in the intercepted datastream” (column 4, line 15). However, *Wagner* fails to suggest an “apparatus for preventing entries or submissions of data via an input screen displayed on a client device... ***wherein the source code defines a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 5. For at least these reasons, claim 5 is allowable.

C. Claim 10 is Allowable Over *Brown*, *Castro*, and *Wagner*

The Office Action indicates that claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,278,448 (“*Brown*”) and further in view of HTML For the World Wide Web: 4th Edition with XHTML and CSS: Visual Quickstart Guide, 1999 (“*Castro*”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,085,224 (“*Wagner*”). This rejection

is improper for at least the reason that *Brown* in view of *Castro* and *Wagner* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 10. More specifically, claim 10 recites:

A computer-readable medium having computer-executable components comprising:

a form definition component defining a data input screen and a data submission field;

a style definition component defining a layer having a width and height at least as large as the data submission field;

a function definition component responsive to the data submission field, wherein upon execution of the function definition component, the layer operates to render the data submission field inaccessible on the form during execution of the function definition component, wherein the data submission field is rendered accessible upon completion of execution of the function definition component,

wherein the computer-executable components are operable to perform the following:

associating the executable script with a predetermined z-index number for a web page,

rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page that have a z-index number lower than the predetermined z-index number; and

defining a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety.

(Emphasis added).

Claim 10 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Brown*, *Castro*, and *Wagner*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a “computer-readable medium having computer-executable components comprising... ***defining a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 10. More specifically, claim 10 includes allowable portions of claim 25. Further, *Brown* discloses “creating a composite desktop built from Web content retrieved from one or more Websites... [This] includes selecting one or more components of Web pages to be positioned on the composite desktop” (column 2, line 55). As is clearly evident, his is completely different than “***defining a membrane that is***

initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety” as recited in claim 10.

Similarly, *Castro* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown*. More specifically, *Castro* discloses “HTML 4 for the World Wide Web: Visual Quickstart Guide” (title), which is unquestionably different than “***defining a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 10.

Further, *Wagner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown* and *Castro*. More specifically, *Wagner* discloses a “method and system for responding to hidden data and programs in a data stream” (title), which includes “an interceptor for intercepting a datastream before the datastream is received by an application program... [and] a scanner for scanning the intercepted data stream to detect a trigger event in the intercepted datastream” (column 4, line 15). However, *Wagner* fails to suggest “***defining a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 10. For at least these reasons, claim 10 is allowable.

D. Claim 15 is Allowable Over *Brown*, *Castro*, and *Wagner*

The Office Action indicates that claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,278,448 (“*Brown*”) and further in view of HTML For the World Wide Web: 4th Edition with XHTML and CSS: Visual Quickstart Guide, 1999 (“*Castro*”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,085,224 (“*Wagner*”). This rejection is improper for at least the reason that *Brown* in view of *Castro* and *Wagner* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 15. More specifically, claim 15 recites:

A method for preventing data entry to a server computer from a client computer, comprising:

receiving a request for an exchange of data from the client computer;

defining an executable script within a source code, the executable script operating in response to a client computer input and rendering a data input screen inaccessible to prevent duplicative processing of a subsequent input from the client computer during the operation of the executable script, the input screen being rendered accessible in response to completion of the operation of the executable script; and

providing the source code that defines the data input screen;

wherein defining further comprises:

associating the executable script with a predetermined z-index number for a web page; and

rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page that have a z-index number lower than the predetermined z-index number; and

wherein the source code defines a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety.

(Emphasis added).

Claim 15 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Brown*, *Castro*, and *Wagner*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a “method for preventing data entry to a server computer from a client computer... ***wherein the source code defines a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 15. More specifically, claim 15 includes allowable portions of claim 25. Further, *Brown* discloses “creating a composite desktop built from Web content retrieved from one or more Websites... [This] includes selecting one or more components of Web pages to be positioned on the composite desktop” (column 2, line 55). As is clearly evident, this is completely different than a “method for preventing data entry to a server computer from a client computer... ***wherein the source code defines a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 15.

Similarly, *Castro* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown*. More specifically, *Castro* discloses “HTML 4 for the World Wide Web: Visual Quickstart Guide” (title), which is

unquestionably different than a “method for preventing data entry to a server computer from a client computer... ***wherein the source code defines a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 15.

Further, *Wagner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown* and *Castro*. More specifically, *Wagner* discloses a “method and system for responding to hidden data and programs in a data stream” (title), which includes “an interceptor for intercepting a datastream before the datastream is received by an application program... [and] a scanner for scanning the intercepted data stream to detect a trigger event in the intercepted datastream” (column 4, line 15). However, *Wagner* fails to suggest a “method for preventing data entry to a server computer from a client computer... ***wherein the source code defines a membrane that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 15. For at least these reasons, claim 15 is allowable.

E. Claim 24 is Allowable Over *Brown*, *Castro*, and *Wagner*

The Office Action indicates that claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,278,448 (“*Brown*”) and further in view of HTML For the World Wide Web: 4th Edition with XHTML and CSS: Visual Quickstart Guide, 1999 (“*Castro*”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,085,224 (“*Wagner*”). This rejection is improper for at least the reason that *Brown* in view of *Castro* and *Wagner* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 24. More specifically, claim 24 recites:

A method for preventing data entry to a web page comprising:

- associating an executable script with the web page;

- determining if the web page used z-index numbers;

- permitting a first data input to the web page;

- executing, in response to the first data input, the executable script; and

- preventing data entry to at least a portion of the web page after execution of the script to prevent duplicative processing of the first data input and a second data input, wherein preventing further comprises:

 - associating the executable script with a predetermined z-index number for the web page if the web page supports using the z-index number;

 - associating the executable script with a division of the web page if the web page does not support using the z-index number;

 - rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page by rendering the division of the web page visible over the data entry elements if the web page does not support using the z-index number; and

 - rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page that have a z-index number lower than the predetermined z-index number if the web page supports using the z-index number,

 - wherein upon completion of the execution of the script, the data entry elements associated with the web page are rendered accessible, and

 - wherein a membrane is defined that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety.***

(Emphasis added).

Claim 24 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Brown*, *Castro*, and *Wagner*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a “method for preventing data entry to a web page comprising... ***wherein a membrane is defined that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 24. More specifically, claim 24 includes allowable portions of claim 25. Further, *Brown* discloses “creating a composite desktop built from Web content retrieved from one or more Websites... [This] includes selecting one or more components of Web pages to be positioned on the composite desktop” (column 2, line 55). As is clearly evident, this is completely different than a “method for preventing data entry to a web page

comprising... ***wherein a membrane is defined that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 24.

Similarly, *Castro* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown*. More specifically, *Castro* discloses “HTML 4 for the World Wide Web: Visual Quickstart Guide” (title), which is unquestionably different than a “method for preventing data entry to a web page comprising... ***wherein a membrane is defined that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 24.

Further, *Wagner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown* and *Castro*. More specifically, *Wagner* discloses a “method and system for responding to hidden data and programs in a data stream” (title), which includes “an interceptor for intercepting a datastream before the datastream is received by an application program... [and] a scanner for scanning the intercepted data stream to detect a trigger event in the intercepted datastream” (column 4, line 15). However, *Wagner* fails to suggest a “method for preventing data entry to a web page comprising... ***wherein a membrane is defined that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 24. For at least these reasons, claim 24 is allowable.

F. Claims 2 – 4, 6 – 9, 11 – 14, 16, and 17 are Allowable Over *Brown*, *Castro*, and *Wagner*

The Office Action indicates that claims 2 – 4, 6 – 9, 11 – 14, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,278,448 (“*Brown*”) and further in view of HTML For the World Wide Web: 4th Edition with XHTML and CSS: Visual Quickstart Guide, 1999 (“*Castro*”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,085,224 (“*Wagner*”). This rejection is improper for at least the reason that *Brown* in view of *Castro* and *Wagner* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 2 – 4, 6 – 9,

11 – 14, 16, and 17. More specifically, dependent claims 2 – 4 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 1. Dependent claims 6 – 9 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 5. Dependent claims 11 – 14 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 10. Further, dependent claims 16 and 17 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 15. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

G. Claim 18 is Allowable Over *Moneymaker*, *Castro*, and *Wagner*

The Office Action indicates that claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Number 2002/0049708 (“*Moneymaker*”) and further in view of HTML For the World Wide Web: 4th Edition with XHTML and CSS: Visual Quickstart Guide, 1999 (“*Castro*”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,085,224 (“*Wagner*”). This rejection is improper for at least the reason that *Moneymaker* in view of *Castro* and *Wagner* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 18. More specifically, claim 18 recites:

A method for preventing data entry to a web page comprising:

associating an executable script with the web page;

permitting a first data input to the web page;

executing, in response to the first data input, the executable script; and

preventing data entry to at least a portion of the web page after execution of the script to prevent duplicative processing of the first data input and a second data input, wherein preventing further comprises:

associating the executable script with a predetermined z-index number for the web page; and

rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page that have a z-index number lower than the predetermined z-index number,

wherein upon completion of the execution of the script, the data entry elements associated with the web page are rendered accessible, and

wherein a membrane is defined that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety.

(Emphasis added).

Claim 18 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Brown*, *Castro*, and *Wagner*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a “method for preventing data entry to a web page comprising... ***wherein a membrane is defined that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 18. More specifically, claim 18 includes allowable portions of claim 25. Further, *Brown* discloses “creating a composite desktop built from Web content retrieved from one or more Websites... [This] includes selecting one or more components of Web pages to be positioned on the composite desktop” (column 2, line 55). However, this is completely different than a “method for preventing data entry to a web page comprising... ***wherein a membrane is defined that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 18.

Similarly, *Castro* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown*. More specifically, *Castro* discloses “HTML 4 for the World Wide Web: Visual Quickstart Guide” (title), which is

unquestionably different than a “method for preventing data entry to a web page comprising...

wherein a membrane is defined that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety” as recited in claim 18.

Further, *Wagner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brown* and *Castro*. More specifically, *Wagner* discloses a “method and system for responding to hidden data and programs in a data stream” (title), which includes “an interceptor for intercepting a datastream before the datastream is received by an application program... [and] a scanner for scanning the intercepted data stream to detect a trigger event in the intercepted datastream” (column 4, line 15). However, *Wagner* fails to suggest a “method for preventing data entry to a web page comprising... ***wherein a membrane is defined that is initially hidden and is positioned and sized such that the membrane covers the web page in its entirety***” as recited in claim 18.

For at least these reasons, claim 18 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or addressed, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/afb/

Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012

AT&T Legal Department – TKHR

Attn: Patent Docketing

One AT&T Way

Room 2A-207

Bedminster, NJ 07921

Customer No.: **38823**